

Application/Control Number: 10/003,094
Art Unit: 2655

Docket No.: 2000-0600

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 18, 19 and 22 remain pending, claims 1, 7 and 18 having been amended, and claims 2, 8, 12-17, 20, 21, 23 and 24 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 7, and 9-11

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6, 7, and 9-11 as allegedly being anticipated by published U.S. Patent Application 2002/0007276 to Rosenblatt et al. ("Rosenblatt"). Applicants traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 1 was amended to include the features of claim 2 and independent claim 7 was amended to include the features of claim 8. On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Applicants' arguments, filed January 14, 2005, with respect to the rejection of claims 2 and 8 have been considered and are persuasive. That is, the Examiner admitted that claims 2 and 8 are patentable over Rosenblatt in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,857,099 to Mitchell et al. ("Mitchell"). Therefore, claims 1 and 7 are certainly patentable over Rosenblatt.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a method of delivering a multi-media message to a recipient, wherein the multi-media message is created by a sender for delivery by an animated entity. The method includes, among other things, after recording an audio message from the sender, converting the audio message to a text message and presenting a text version of the audio message to the sender.

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that U.S. Patent No. 6,219,638 to Padmanabhan et al. ("Padmanabhan"), at col. 4, lines 14-30, discloses or suggests presenting a text version of the audio message to the sender, as required by claim 2, now amended claim 1. Applicants disagree.

Application/Control Number: 10/003,094
Art Unit: 2655

Docket No.: 2000-0600

Padmanabhan, at col. 4, lines 14-30, discloses:

Speech recognition server transcribes the speech to text using automatic speech recognition algorithms (possibly using natural language processing to filter the transcription) and transfers the transcribed text back to telephony server 26 with some diagnostics (such as the likelihood scores produced for each word in the utterance, or confidence measure relating to each word in the utterance, or duration of each word or subword, etc.

Telephony server 26 then transfers the text and diagnostics to a speech synthesis server 34 which produces synthesized speech and sends the speech back to telephony server 26. Telephony server 26 then plays the speech back to the user over the telephone line (note that this speech corresponds to the transcription produced by speech recognition server 32 which may be full of errors) in accordance with the invention.

Thus, Padmanabhan discloses transcribing speech to text and transferring text and diagnostics to a speech synthesis server, which produces synthesized speech to be played over a telephone line.

Although the synthesized speech of Padmanabhan is produced from the text, Applicants submit that playing the synthesized speech, corresponding to the text is not equivalent to presenting a text version of the audio message to the sender, as required by amended claim 1.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over Rosenblatt and Padmanabhan and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1, dependent claims 3-6, amended independent claim 7 and dependent claims 9-11 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 18-20 and 22-24

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 18-20 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,289,085 to Miyashita et al. ("Miyashita"). Applicants submit that amended claim 18 obviates the rejection with respect to claims 18, 19 and 22. Claims 20, 21, 23 and 24 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby making the rejection moot with respect to these claims.

Application/Control Number: 10/003,094
Art Unit: 2655

Docket No.: 2000-0600

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 20, 21, 23 and 24 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claims 18 is directed to a method of providing a synthesized voice with sender voice characteristics. The method includes, among other things, after receiving the audio recording, using an automatic speech recognizer and presenting a text version of the audio recording to the sender for approval. Applicants submit that Miyashita is completely devoid of any disclosure or suggestion of such a feature. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 18 and dependent claims 19 and 22 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2 and 8

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 8 as allegedly being unpatentable over Rosenblatt in view of Padmanabhan. Applicants incorporated the features of claims 2 and 8 into independent claims 1 and 7, respectively, and canceled claims 2 and 8 without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2 and 8 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 12-15

On page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12-15 as allegedly being unpatentable over Rosenblatt in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,393,107 to Ball et al. ("Ball"). Applicants canceled claims 12-15 without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby making the rejection moot. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 12-15 be withdrawn.

Application/Control Number: 10/003,094
Art Unit: 2655

Docket No.: 2000-0600

Rejection of Claims 16 and 17

On page 12 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rosenblatt in view of Ball and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,085 to Miyashita et al. ("Miyashita"). Applicants canceled claims 16 and 17 without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby making the rejection moot. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 16 and 17 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 21

On page 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Miyashita in view of Padmanabhan. Applicants amended claim 18 to include the features of claim 21 and canceled claim 21 without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby making the rejection moot. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 18, on page 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner admitted that Miyashita does not disclose after receiving an audio recording, using an automatic speech recognizer and presenting a text version of the audio recording to a sender for approval before parameterizing the audio recording. Applicants submit, at least for reasons similar to those presented with respect to claim 1, that Padmanabhan also does not satisfy the deficiencies of Miyashita.

Application/Control Number: 10/003,094
Art Unit: 2655

Docket No.: 2000-0600

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections and objections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 24, 2005

By: Richard C. Irving

Correspondence Address:

Samuel H. Dworetsky
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-414-3056
Fax No.: 410-510-1433